

Pat



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,028	05/07/2001	Kevin Tso	45134/MAK/K296	2493
23363	7590	08/26/2004	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			LEZAK, ARRIENNE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/851,028	TSO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Arrienne M. Lezak	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *                                                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/31/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over complete consideration of "Ariadne: a Java-based guided tour system for the World Wide Web", Juhne, Jesper, Computer Networks and ISDN Systems 30 (1998) 131-139 alone or in view of US Patent US 6,728,762 B1 to Estrada.

3. Regarding Claims 1, 2, 11, 15, 16, 20 & 21, Ariadne discloses a system, method and computer-readable medium for electronically providing a guided tour using a plurality of web pages (on an Internet network - per pending Claims 15 & 20) comprising the steps of:

- storing information about a plurality of web pages a database, (Ariadne, p.6, Col. 2);
- storing information about an order of display of the plurality of web pages in the database, (Ariadne, p.6, Col.2);
- receiving a request for web page information, (Ariadne, p.6, Col.2);
- sending the information about a plurality of web pages to user to enable the user to view the plurality of web pages in the order of display stored in the databas, (Ariadne, p.5, Col. 2 & p.6, Col. 2).

- prompting a first user to select a plurality of web pages for a guided tour, (Ariadne, Abstract);
- receiving from the first user information about a plurality of web pages, (Ariadne, p.1, Col. 1);
- prompting the first user to select an order for sending information about the selected plurality of web pages to a second user, (Ariadne, p.1, Col. 1); and
- receiving from the first user an order for sending information about the selected plurality of web pages to the second user, (Ariadne, p.1, Col. 1).

4. Examiner notes that Ariadne teaches a guided tour system for the Internet, wherein a guided tour is well known in the art, and wherein a guided tour would obviously be created through selection of pages and page order by a tour author. Additionally, Examiner notes that Estrada discloses a non-HTML to HTML conversion functionality, (Estrada - Col. 5, lines 43-45 & Col. 21, lines 1-24), which specifically teaches the conversion of Power Point presentations to HTML web pages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to choose a web page incorporating a Power Point presentation for educational purposes, (Ariadne, p. 4, Col. 2), as Power Point is a well-known means by which presentations are organized and executed. Moreover, Examiner notes that Power Point presentations obviously require authoring, which authoring inherently includes specifically enumerating the order of page presentation, and which pages are web pages when converted to HTML, as taught by Estrada. Thus, Claims 1, 2, 11, 15, 16,

Art Unit: 2143

20 & 21 are found to be unpatentable over the teachings of Ariadne alone or in view of Estrada.

5. Regarding Claims 3, 12 & 17, the teachings of Ariadne alone and in view of Estrada is relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Moreover, in incorporating Power Point presentations, Estrada discloses a system, method and computer-readable medium for electronically providing a guided tour further comprising:

- prompting the first user to select a time lapse in between the sending of each of the plurality of web pages to the second user, (Estrada - Col. 5, lines 43-45 & Col. 21, lines 1-24);
- receiving from the first user a time lapse to be tolled before sending information about each of a plurality of web pages to the second user, (Estrada - Col. 5, lines 43-45 & Col. 21, lines 1-24);
- storing the time lapse received from the first user in the database, (Estrada - Col. 5, lines 43-45 & Col. 21, lines 1-24); and
- tolling the time lapse received from the first user before sending information about each of the plurality of web pages to the second user, (Estrada - Col. 5, lines 43-45 & Col. 21, lines 1-24), (Examiner notes that it is well known in the art that a time lapse, (between page presentation), functionality is contained within a Power Point application).

Thus, Claims 3, 12 & 17 are found to be unpatentable over the teachings of Ariadne in view of Estrada.

Art Unit: 2143

6. Regarding Claim 4, the teachings of Ariadne alone and in view of Estrada is relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Moreover, Ariadne discloses a system, method and computer-readable medium for electronically providing a guided tour wherein the information about each of a plurality of web pages obviously comprises the location the web page and request information to generate the web page, (Ariadne – p. 6, Col. 2 – Examiner notes that in searching and locating a guided tour within a database, it would be obvious that said database maintain information pertaining to web page location and generation as without the same, said database would be useless as a search tool for guided tours), (Examiner further notes Estrada teaches documentation location information as well – Col. 3, lines 60-64). Thus, Claim 4 is found to be unpatentable over the teachings of Ariadne in view of Estrada.

7. Regarding Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 18 & 19, the teachings of Ariadne alone and in view of Estrada is relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Moreover, Ariadne discloses a system, method and computer-readable medium for electronically providing a guided tour further comprising:

- prompting the first user to add an annotation onto each of the plurality of web pages, wherein the annotation is at least one of the group consisting of text, graphics, sound, and video, (per pending Claims 6, 14 & 19), (Ariadne – p.2, Col. 2 & p. 3, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 2, lines 37-67; Col. 3, lines 1-4; and Col. 5, lines 55-67);

Art Unit: 2143

- receiving from the first user an annotation to at least one of the plurality of web pages, (Ariadne – p.2, Col. 2 & p. 3, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 2, lines 37-67; Col. 3, lines 1-4; and Col. 5, lines 55-67);
- storing the annotation to at least one of the plurality of web pages to the database, (Ariadne – p.2, Col. 2 & p. 3, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 2, lines 37-67; Col. 3, lines 1-4; and Col. 5, lines 55-67);
- sending to the second user information about the annotation along with the information about the corresponding web page to the annotation, (Ariadne – p.2, Col. 2 & p. 3, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 2, lines 37-67; Col. 3, lines 1-4; and Col. 5, lines 55-67).

Thus, Claims 5, 6, 13, 14, 18 & 19 are found to be unpatentable over the teachings of Ariadne in view of Estrada.

8. Regarding Claims 7-9, the teachings of Ariadne alone and in view of Estrada is relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Moreover, Ariadne discloses a system, method and computer-readable medium for electronically providing a guided tour further comprising:

- sending to the second user a list containing information about each of the plurality of web pages for which information is stored in the database, (per pending Claim 9), (Ariadne – p. 6, Col. 1 & p. 7, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 21, lines 1-24), (Examiner notes that it is well known in the art that Power Point provides a list of pages available for viewing, which pages may be viewed

and edited in any order, and which pages may contain multimedia as well as links to other web pages);

- prompting the second user to receive information about a web page earlier, (or later – per pending Claim 8), in the order to the one the plurality of web pages last sent, (Ariadne – p. 6, Col. 1 & p. 7, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 21, lines 1-24);
- receiving from the second user a request, (selection), to receive information about a web page earlier, (or later), in the order to the one of the plurality of web pages last sent, (Ariadne – p. 6, Col. 1 & p. 7, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 21, lines 1-24); and
- sending to the second user information about web page earlier, (or later), in the order the one of the plurality of web pages last sent, (Ariadne – p. 6, Col. 1 & p. 7, Col. 1), (Estrada – Col. 21, lines 1-24).

Thus, Claims 7-9 are found to be unpatentable over the teachings of Ariadne in view of Estrada.

9. Regarding Claim 10, the teachings of Ariadne alone and in view of Estrada is relied upon for those teachings disclosed herein. Moreover, Ariadne discloses a system, method and computer-readable medium for electronically providing a guided tour.

Though Ariadne does not specifically enumerate receiving from the first user an expiration date, storing the expiration date in the database, comparing the expiration date to a current date, and refusing a request from the second user if the current date is later than the expiration date, Examiner notes that it is well known in the art that the



Art Unit: 2143

removal of information from a database will in effect cause the information to be unavailable. As Ariadne teaches an academic use for the guided tour, (Ariadne – p. 4, Col. 2), it would have been obvious for said guided tour to “expire”, or no longer being available upon request when, for instance, a course has ended or information is updated. Thus, Claim 10 is found to be unpatentable over the teachings of Ariadne in view of Estrada.

### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (703)-305-0717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703)-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AML

Arrienne M. Lezak  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISOR/PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100